



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,248	11/08/2001	William Russell Belknap	SVL920010059US	5036
23373	7590	04/04/2005	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			BONSHOCK, DENNIS G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/986,248

Applicant(s)

BELKNAP ET AL.

Examiner

Dennis G. Bonshock

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,12-23,25-29,31 and 32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,12-23,25-29,31 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Final Rejection

Response to Amendment

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed on record in the file: Amendment as received on 12-08-2004.

2. Claims 1-33 have been examined.

Status of Claims:

3. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13-15, 20-22, 25, 26, 28, 29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Halpern et al., patent #6,282,711, hereinafter Halpern.

4. Claims 4, 5, 16 and 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halpern.

5. Claims 6, 7, 12, 18, 19, 23, 27, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halpern and Feinman, patent #6,075,943.

6. Claims 11, 24, 30, and 33 have been canceled by the applicant.

Claim Objections

7. Claim 12 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The claim recites the exact same limitation as is presented in independent claim 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3, 13-15, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Halpern et al., patent #6,282,711, hereinafter Halpern.

3. With regard to claim 1, which teaches a method of requesting and processing a plurality of objects from a server, comprising: requesting a plurality of objects from the server, Halpern teaches, in column 3, lines 16-38 and in column 5, lines 5-51, a user selecting a plurality of objects from a server. With regard to claim 1, further teaching receiving a response message from the server, the response message containing the plurality of objects packed into the response message, Halpern teaches, in column 3, line 61 through column 4, line 5 and column 6, lines 1-28, the client receiving a package from the server containing the plurality of selected objects. With regard to claim 1, further teaching automatically unpacking the plurality of objects contained in the response message, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 44-64, and in column 4, lines 14-19, an automatic unpacking of objects that doesn't require user interaction.

4. With regard to claims 2, 14 and 26, which teach decompressing the plurality of unpacked objects, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 44-64, the automatic decompression of the transferred objects.

5. With regard to claims 3 and 15, which teach decompressing the plurality of unpacked objects automatically in response to receiving the response message, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 44-64, the automatic decompression of the transferred objects.

9. With regard to claim 13, which teaches a client processor, comprising: a communications module configured for receiving a response message from the server, the response message containing the plurality of objects packed into the response message, Halpern teaches, in column 3, line 61 through column 4, line 5 and column 6, lines 1-28, the client receiving a package from the server containing the plurality of selected objects. With regard to claim 13, further teaching automatically unpacking the plurality of objects contained in the response message, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 44-64, and in column 4, lines 14-19, an automatic unpacking of objects that doesn't require user interaction. With regard to claim 13, further teaching a browser coupled to the unpacking module, configured to present the plurality of unpacked objects to a user, Halpern further teaches, in column 4, line 54 through column 5, line 5, providing a display of the transfer system through the use of a browser.

11. With regard to claim 25, which teaches a computer readable medium for requesting and processing a plurality of objects from a server, comprising: program instructions for requesting a plurality of objects from the server, Halpern teaches, in

column 3, lines 16-38 and in column 5, lines 5-51, a user selecting a plurality of objects from a server. With regard to claim 25, further teaching program instructions for receiving a response message from the server, the response message containing the plurality of objects packed into the response message, Halpern teaches, in column 3, line 61 through column 4, line 5 and column 6, lines 1-28, the client receiving a package from the server containing the plurality of selected objects. With regard to claim 25, further teaching program instructions for automatically unpacking the plurality of objects contained in the response message, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 44-64, and in column 4, lines 14-19, an automatic unpacking of objects that doesn't require user interaction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 4, 5, 16 and 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halpern.

16. With regard to claim 4 and 16, which teach requesting a plurality of objects comprises packing a plurality of requests for the plurality of objects into a packed request message and transmitting the packed request message to the server, Halpern teaches requests sent to the server for a plurality of objects (see column 3, lines 16-38 and column 5, lines 5-51), he however doesn't specifically specify if the requests are

Art Unit: 2173

sent individually for each object or as packed request. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Halpern to provide the user with the option of sending the request to the server as either a single package or as a plurality of packages, similar to how Halpern offers the transfer of data between the server and the client (see column 3, line 61 through column 4, line 9 and in column 6, lines 17-28). One would have been motivated to make such a combination because in the bi-directional transfer system of Halpern, it would be beneficial, in terms of time saved in the case of lost objects, to provide the same optional packeting of objects in the client to server transfer.

17. With regard to claims 5 and 17, which teach requesting a plurality of objects comprises transmitting to the server separate requests for each of the plurality of objects, Halpern teaches requests sent to the server for a plurality of objects (see column 3, lines 16-38 and column 5, lines 5-51), he however doesn't specifically specify if the requests are sent individually for each object or as packed request. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Halpern to provide the user with the option of sending the request to the server as either a single package or as a plurality of packages, similar to how Halpern offers the transfer of data between the server and the client (see column 3, line 61 through column 4, line 9 and in column 6, lines 17-28). One would have been motivated to make such a combination because in the bi-directional transfer system of Halpern, it would be beneficial, in terms of time saved in the case of lost objects, to provide the same optional packeting of objects in the client to server transfer.

18. Claims 6-10, 12, 18-23, 27-29, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halpern and Feinman, patent #6,075,943.

19. With regard to claims 6, 18, and 27, Halpern teaches a system for the transfer of multiple objects between a server and a client and outputting a plurality of unpacked objects (see column 6, lines 1-67), but doesn't specifically teach outputting the plurality of objects in an order indicated in the response message. Feinman teaches a system for packaging up one or more applications for transfer between a server and a client (see column 2, lines 34-45) similar to that of Halpern, but further teaches, in column 3, line 43 through column 4, line 12, the outputting of applications having a certain order, as indicated by the server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Halpern and Feinman to include an ordering of objects, as did Feinman in the object transfer system of Halpern. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would provide an efficient means for allowing the server to dictate the order in which objects must be presented.

20. With regard to claims 7 and 19, which further teaches the plurality of unpacked objects being presented by a browser in the order the objects are output, Halpern further teaches, in column 4, line 54 through column 5, line 5, providing a display of the transfer system through the use of a browser.

6. With regard to claim 8, which teaches a method of transferring a plurality of objects from a server to a client comprising: receiving a request from the client for the plurality of objects, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 1-5, the request for a plurality of objects. With regard to claim 8, further teaching retrieving the plurality of requested

Art Unit: 2173

objects from one or more object stores, Halpern teaches, in column 5, lines 49-55 and in column 6, lines 1-5, the server retrieving the requested objects from a component pool. With regard to claim 8, further teaching automatically packing the retrieved plurality of objects into a response message, Halpern teaches, in column 5, lines 49-55 and in column 6, lines 1-15, the server retrieving the requested objects from a component pool and forms a customized non-binging set of files. With regard to claim 8, further teaching transmitting the response message to the client, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 17-19, the executable prepared by the packager being transmitted over a network to the client. Halpern teaches a system for the transfer of multiple objects between a server and a client and outputting a plurality of unpacked objects (see column 6, lines 1-67), but doesn't specifically teach the response message including an indicator of the order in which the packed objects are to be presented. Feinman teaches a system for packaging up one or more applications for transfer between a server and a client (see column 2, lines 34-45) similar to that of Halpern, but further teaches, in column 3, line 43 through column 4, line 12, the outputting of applications providing an indication of a certain order, as indicated by the server. The compression and decompression of the files done by compression and decompression programs (column 3, lines 7-43), where the automatic installations system builds a command for the remote submission, the command (indication) containing the name of the appropriate decompression program to run (which specifies the order to present data) (see column 5, lines 49-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Halpern and Feinman to include an ordering of objects, as

did Feinman in the object transfer system of Halpern. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would provide an efficient means for allowing the server to dictate the order in which objects must be presented.

7. With regard to claims 9, 21, and 29, which teach automatically compressing the retrieved plurality of requested objects prior to packing the objects into the response message, Halpern teaches, in column 3, line 61 through column 4, line 5, the step of compressing and packaging the files together before transfer.

8. With regard to claims 10 and 22, which teaches automatically compressing the response message prior to transmitting the response message to the client, Halpern teaches, in column 3, line 61 through column 4, line 5, the step of compressing and packaging the files together before transfer.

22. With regard to claim 12, Halpern teaches a system for the transfer of multiple objects between a server and a client and outputting a plurality of unpacked objects (see column 6, lines 1-67), but doesn't specifically teach the response message including an indicator of the order in which the packed objects are to be presented. Feinman teaches a system for packaging up one or more applications for transfer between a server and a client (see column 2, lines 34-45) similar to that of Halpern, but further teaches, in column 3, line 43 through column 4, line 12, the outputting of applications providing an indication of a certain order, as indicated by the server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Halpern and Feinman to include an ordering of objects, as did Feinman in the object transfer system of Halpern. One would have been motivated to make such a

combination because this would provide an efficient means for allowing the server to dictate the order in which objects must be presented.

10. With regard to claim 20, which teaches a server processor comprising: a module configured to receiving a request from the client for the plurality of objects, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 1-5, the request for a plurality of objects. With regard to claim 20, further teaching a processor configured for retrieving the plurality of requested objects from one or more object stores, Halpern teaches, in column 5, lines 49-55 and in column 6, lines 1-5, the server retrieving the requested objects from a component pool. With regard to claim 20, further teaching a module configured to automatically packing the retrieved plurality of objects into a response message, Halpern teaches, in column 5, lines 49-55 and in column 6, lines 1-15, the server retrieving the requested objects from a component pool and forms a customized non-binging set of files. With regard to claim 20, further teaching a module configured to transmit the response message to the client, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lies 17-19, the executable prepared by the packager being transmitted over a network to the client. Halpern teaches a system for the transfer of multiple objects between a server and a client and outputting a plurality of unpacked objects (see column 6, lines 1-67), but doesn't specifically teach the response message including an indicator of the order in which the packed objects are to be presented. Feinman teaches a system for packaging up one or more applications for transfer between a server and a client (see column 2, lines 34-45) similar to that of Halpern, but further teaches, in column 3, line 43 through column 4, line 12, the outputting of applications providing an indication of a certain order, as

indicated by the server. The compression and decompression of the files done by compression and decompression programs (column 3, lines 7-43), where the automatic installations system builds a command for the remote submission, the command (indication) containing the name of the appropriate decompression program to run (which specifies the order to present data) (see column 5, lines 49-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Halpern and Feinman to include an ordering of objects, as did Feinman in the object transfer system of Halpern. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would provide an efficient means for allowing the server to dictate the order in which objects must be presented.

21. With regard to claims 23 and 32, Halpern teaches a system for the transfer of multiple objects between a server and a client and outputting a plurality of unpacked objects (see column 6, lines 1-67), but doesn't specifically teach the retrieved objects being packed into the response message in a designated order. Feinman teaches a system for packaging up one or more applications for transfer between a server and a client (see column 2, lines 34-45) similar to that of Halpern, but further teaches, in column 3, line 43 through column 4, line 12, the outputting of applications having a certain order, as indicated by the server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Halpern and Feinman to include an ordering of objects, as did Feinman in the object transfer system of Halpern. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would provide an efficient means for allowing the server to dictate the order in which objects must be presented.

12. With regard to claim 28, which teaches a method of transferring a plurality of objects from a server to a client comprising: program instructions for receiving a request from the client for the plurality of objects, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 1-5, the request for a plurality of objects. With regard to claim 28, further teaching program instructions for retrieving the plurality of requested objects from one or more object stores, Halpern teaches, in column 5, lines 49-55 and in column 6, lines 1-5, the server retrieving the requested objects from a component pool. With regard to claim 28, further teaching program instructions for automatically packing the retrieved plurality of objects into a response message, Halpern teaches, in column 5, lines 49-55 and in column 6, lines 1-15, the server retrieving the requested objects from a component pool and forms a customized non-binging set of files. With regard to claim 28, further teaching program instructions for transmitting the response message to the client, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 17-19, the executable prepared by the packager being transmitted over a network to the client. Halpern teaches a system for the transfer of multiple objects between a server and a client and outputting a plurality of unpacked objects (see column 6, lines 1-67), but doesn't specifically teach the response message including an indicator of the order in which the packed objects are to be presented. Feinman teaches a system for packaging up one or more applications for transfer between a server and a client (see column 2, lines 34-45) similar to that of Halpern, but further teaches, in column 3, line 43 through column 4, line 12, the outputting of applications providing an indication of a certain order, as indicated by the server. The compression and decompression of the files done by compression and

decompression programs (column 3, lines 7-43), where the automatic installations system builds a command for the remote submission, the command (indication) containing the name of the appropriate decompression program to run (which specifies the order to present data) (see column 5, lines 49-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Halpern and Feinman to include an ordering of objects, as did Feinman in the object transfer system of Halpern. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would provide an efficient means for allowing the server to dictate the order in which objects must be presented.

13. With regard to claim 31, which teaches a method of transferring a plurality of objects from a server to a client comprising: receiving a request from the client for the plurality of objects, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 1-5, the request for a plurality of objects. With regard to claim 31, further teaching retrieving the plurality of requested objects from an object stores, Halpern teaches, in column 5, lines 49-55 and in column 6, lines 1-5, the server retrieving the requested objects from a component pool. With regard to claim 31, further teaching packing the retrieved plurality of objects into a response message, Halpern teaches, in column 5, lines 49-55 and in column 6, lines 1-15, the server retrieving the requested objects from a component pool and forms a customized non-binging set of files. With regard to claim 31, further teaching transmitting the response message to the client, Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 17-19, the executable prepared by the packager being transmitted over a network to the client. Halpern teaches a system for the transfer of multiple objects between a server

Art Unit: 2173

and a client and outputting a plurality of unpacked objects (see column 6, lines 1-67), but doesn't specifically teach the response message including an indicator of the order in which the packed objects are to be presented. Feinman teaches a system for packaging up one or more applications for transfer between a server and a client (see column 2, lines 34-45) similar to that of Halpern, but further teaches, in column 3, line 43 through column 4, line 12, the outputting of applications providing an indication of a certain order, as indicated by the server. The compression and decompression of the files done by compression and decompression programs (column 3, lines 7-43), where the automatic installations system builds a command for the remote submission, the command (indication) containing the name of the appropriate decompression program to run (which specifies the order to present data) (see column 5, lines 49-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Halpern and Feinman to include an ordering of objects, as did Feinman in the object transfer system of Halpern. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would provide an efficient means for allowing the server to dictate the order in which objects must be presented.

Response to Arguments

23. The arguments filed on 12-08-2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Reasons set forth below.

24. The applicants' argue that Halpern does not automatically unpack objects.

25. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that Halpern teaches, in column 6, lines 44-64, and in column 4, lines 14-19, the ability for the client installer program to

Art Unit: 2173

be configured to permit the contents of the delivered package to be installed (unpacked) without further user interaction (automatically). This is set up as an alternate method and the examiner agrees that the reference teaches other modes of operation.

26. The applicants' argue that Feinman does not teach or suggest a method "wherein the response message includes an indicator of the order in which the packed objects are to be presented."

27. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that Feinman teaches, in column 3, line 43 through column 4, line 12, the outputting of applications providing an indication of a certain order, as indicated by the server. The automatic installation system of Feinman, as shown in column 3, lines 7-43, shows the application being packed into a compressed file for transition to a remote client, indicating in the compression file all subdirectories the application uses, for eventual decompressing (and unpacking) by the destination, where after compression a list of all files in the application program is generated to insure proper unpacking. The compression and decompression done by compression and decompression programs (column 3, lines 7-43), where the automatic installations system builds a command for the remote submission, the command (indication) containing the name of the appropriate decompression program to run (which specifies the order to present data) (see column 5, lines 49-55).

Conclusion

28. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

29. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis G. Bonshock whose telephone number is (571) 272-4047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

31. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2173

32. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

3-24-05
dgb



JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER